

FILED ELECTRONICALLY

PATENT APPLICATION  
Docket No. 15436.98.1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:		)
		)
	Paul Sung	)
		)
Serial No.:	10/689,931	) Art Unit
		) 2863
Filed:	October 20, 2003	)
		)
Conf No.:	4863	)
		)
For:	AUTOMATIC DETECTION OF PRODUCTION	)
	AND MANUFACTURING DATA CORRUPTION	)
		)
Examiner:	Stephen J. Cherry	)
		)
Customer No.:	022913	)

**RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES**

**MAIL STOP: AMENDMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants submit this paper in response to the Office Action mailed February 7, 2008 (the "Office Action"). In the Office Action, the Examiner set forth an Election of Species Requirement that identified what the Examiner has characterized as two (2) distinct species. In particular, the Examiner suggested in the Office Action that the present application contains claims directed to the following species:

Species I as method involving processing of new, previously uncalibrated devices, as claimed in claims 36-44 and 54; and

Species II as method involving processing of previously calibrated devices, as claimed in claims 48-53 and 56-57.

The Applicants hereby elect Species I (claims 36-44 and 54) *with traverse*. As to such traversal, Applicant notes that the Examiner has characterized independent claim 48 as being directed to a method involving processing of “previously calibrated devices.” In fact, however, claim 48 does not recite “previously calibrated devices.” Rather, claim 48 refers to “components” that have been “...previously processed by [a] calibrating device.” Moreover, while claim 48 refers to “calibrating devices” that have “previously processed” a “component”, claim 48 does not recite the performance of any procedures on those components, as the Examiner appears to assert. Instead, claim 48 recites processing of the calibration data associated with those components, specifically, “receiving calibration data,” “storing...calibration data,” and “identifying one or more errors in the...calibration data.” *Emphasis added.*

In light of the foregoing points, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the Election of Species Requirement set forth in the Office Action.

Dated this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

**/Peter F. Malen, Jr./Reg.# 45576**

PETER F. MALEN, JR.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 45,576  
**Customer No. 022913**  
Telephone No. 801-533-9800